

Average magnification effect of clumping of matter

T.W.B. Kibble

Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom

kibble@imperial.ac.uk

and

Richard Lieu

Department of Physics, University of Alabama at Huntsville, Huntsville, AL 35899, U.S.A.

lieur@cspars.uah.edu

ABSTRACT

The aim of this paper is to re-examine the question of the average magnification in a universe with some inhomogeneously distributed matter. We present an analytic proof, valid under rather general conditions, including clumps of any shape and size, and strong lensing, that so long as the clumps are uncorrelated the average *reciprocal* magnification (in one of several possible senses) is precisely the same as in a homogeneous universe with equal mean density. From this result, we also show that a similar statement can be made about one definition of average *direct* magnification. We discuss, in the context of observations of discrete and extended sources, the physical significance of the various different measures of magnification and the circumstances in which they are appropriate.

Subject headings: gravitational lensing — galaxies, observations — distance scale, distances and redshifts — cosmology

1. Introduction

There has been considerable debate about the average magnification effect of gravitational lensing by randomly distributed clumps of matter. Weinberg (13) argued that the average magnification produced by randomly distributed masses is exactly the same as that

in a homogeneous universe of equal mean (or pre-clumping) density — the magnification produced by the clumps is largely cancelled by the Dyer–Roeder effect (4; 5). But his arguments have been criticized by Ellis et al. (6), who pointed out that they ignore the effects of caustics. These authors also introduced an important distinction between two measures of distance, which they called ‘area distance’ and ‘angular-size distance’, though in fact both can be applied to either lengths or areas. Holz & Wald (8) developed a general formalism for estimating the probability distribution of magnification, as well as shear and rotation, and obtained numerical results for a range of cosmological parameters using Monte Carlo simulation of light paths. Claudel (3) studied a number of different examples, and concluded that to first order small deviations from homogeneity would not change the average magnification. On the other hand, Rose (12) gave an analytic argument using a spherically symmetric model of the universe with the aim of showing that objects in an inhomogeneous universe appear, on average, more magnified than those at the same redshift in a homogeneous universe with the same mean density. This is not in contradiction with Claudel’s result, because the effect Rose finds is of second order.

The purpose of this paper is to re-examine this question using a simple and explicit analytic approach. We show that under rather general conditions there is at least one measure by which the average reciprocal magnification *is* exactly the same as in an FRW universe with the same mean density. When there is strong lensing, the different measures of distance diverge. It is easier to deal initially with *reciprocal* magnification, because it goes to zero rather than infinity on the caustics. Later, however, we do consider average direct magnification.

Our starting point is in some respects similar to that of Holz & Wald (8), based on using the geodesic deviation equation to follow the paths of light signals back in time. Our goal is more restricted, in that we focus only on average magnification, not rotation and shear. On the other hand, we are seeking analytic rather than purely numerical estimates, so the assumptions we make are slightly more restrictive, though still, we believe, of wide applicability.

Specifically, we assume that in addition to a smooth, homogeneous matter component, with density ρ_h , there is another component comprising widely separated, slow moving and randomly distributed mass clumps (say galaxies, groups, or clusters). For simplicity, we suppose initially that each clump has the same mass M . But it is easy to generalize the discussion to include a distribution of masses, even an evolving one.

Holz and Wald assumed that the universe can be described by a ‘Newtonianly perturbed Friedmann–Robertson–Walker (FRW) universe’ (7), *i.e.* the metric is an FRW metric with the time and space parts multiplied respectively by $(1+2\phi)$ and $(1-2\phi)$, where the convention

of $c = 1$ is adopted here and henceforth. With various assumptions on ϕ and the matter distribution, they showed that ϕ obeys a Poisson equation, with $\delta\rho = \rho - \bar{\rho}$ on the right hand side, where ρ is the density and $\bar{\rho}$ the density of the corresponding FRW universe defined by setting $\phi = 0$. They argue that to determine the way a light signal propagates it is sufficient to look explicitly only at the gravitational potential of nearby clumps.

According to our assumptions, the density perturbation would comprise two contributions, a spatially uniform negative background $\rho_h - \bar{\rho}$, and an occasional large positive contribution from one of the clumps. For most of its journey, a light signal will be travelling through a uniform background, but when it does pass near a clump the effects will be much larger. Under these conditions it is reasonable to assume that we can deal with the effects of the clumps individually. We assume that the clumps are small and slow-moving enough that the gravitational effect of each one may be treated in a Newtonian approximation, with a time-independent Newtonian potential Φ . Moreover, we use the ‘plane lens approximation’, that is, we compute the angle of deviation due to the clump by integrating the gradient of the potential along the undeviated light path, and assume that the deviation effectively occurs at the central plane. As pointed out by Metcalf & Silk (11), this induces a small error because the true light path passes closer to the center. However the discrepancy in the minimum distance from the center is very small, of order the Schwarzschild radius of the clump. Hence the error is tiny and consistently negligible in the Newtonian approximation. Finally, we also assume that far from the clumps there is no appreciable source of shear, so that the Weyl tensor vanishes. Of course, no such assumption is made about the field near each clump.

One criticism that might be made is of our assumption that the clumps are well separated and randomly distributed. This does not mean however that only one clump can significantly affect a light signal at any time (though that may often be true), but rather that the effects of different clumps are purely additive. This seems to us generally a good approximation. The most serious objection would probably be to the assumption that the clumps are *uncorrelated*. Such correlations may invalidate the assumption that there is no source of shear far from the clumps. Even in such cases, the effect on average magnification should be small, since according to the Raychaudhuri equation the effect of shear on expansion is of second order. These correlations might also be thought to call in question the validity of the plane-lens approximation, but this would be true only if the clumps are correlated in such a way that the deviated light paths sample a significantly different environment. Given the extremely small error in the deviation angle ψ (typically of order ψ^2), this seems very unlikely.

It is important to note that the ‘average magnification’ for a given red-shift can mean several different things. In the strong-lensing case, when caustics are present, imaged areas

fold back on themselves. In one sense, the magnification is *negative* in the region beyond the caustic, because images are reversed. In the distinction made by Ellis et al. (6), in computing the *angular-size distance*, these regions are indeed counted negatively, whereas the *area distance* is concerned with the total area, including all the folds; in that case, every contribution is taken positively.

There is another important distinction to be made. We may choose at random one of the sources at red-shift z , or we may choose a random direction in the sky and look for sources there. These are not the same; the choices are differently weighted. If one part of the sky is more magnified, or at closer angular-size distance, the corresponding area of the constant- z surface will be smaller, so fewer sources are likely to be found there. In other words, choosing a source at random will give on average a smaller magnification or larger angular-size distance.

Which of these definitions is appropriate depends on what we choose to look at, and what questions we want to ask. We shall return to the question of which definition to use in various circumstances in a later section.

Let us concentrate for the moment on the random-direction averaging. The question we wish to address is this: How is the average magnification affected by whether the matter is clumped rather than smoothly distributed? We do this by examining the geodesic deviation equation in the presence of clumps.

One other preliminary point should be made. What we are interested in observationally is the average magnification of sources at a given red-shift z . But what we actually calculate is the average of sources at the same affine distance λ (along the backward null geodesics from the present), which is not exactly the same thing. We argue however that the difference is undetectably small. The effect of passing near a clump of mass M affects the relationship between z and λ in much the same way as the conventional gravitational time delay. Thus the difference in z for fixed λ is of order $H_0 GM$ times a logarithmic factor, which is negligible under any reasonable conditions.

2. Null geodesics

The Robertson–Walker line element for an open universe, with $k = -|k|$ and $c = 1$, is

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - a^2(t) \left\{ \frac{dr^2}{1 + |k|r^2} + r^2(d\vartheta^2 + \sin^2 \vartheta d\varphi^2) \right\}, \quad (1)$$

or equivalently, with $\tau = \int dt/a(t)$ and $r = |k|^{-1/2} \sinh(|k|^{1/2} \chi)$,

$$ds^2 = a^2(\tau) \left\{ d\tau^2 - d\chi^2 - \frac{1}{|k|} \sinh^2(|k|^{1/2} \chi) (d\vartheta^2 + \sin^2 \vartheta d\varphi^2) \right\}. \quad (2)$$

Of course in the flat-space limit, $|k| \rightarrow 0$, r and χ become identical.

The Friedmann equation is

$$H^2 = \frac{1}{a^2} \left(\frac{da}{dt} \right)^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3} \rho_m + \frac{|k|}{a^2} + \frac{\Lambda}{3}, \quad (3)$$

where ρ_m is the density of matter (assumed pressureless). Consequently, the relation between the Hubble parameter H and the red-shift, $z = a_0/a(t) - 1$, is $H = H_0 E(z)$, where

$$E^2(z) = \Omega_m(1+z)^3 + (1 - \Omega_m - \Omega_\Lambda)(1+z)^2 + \Omega_\Lambda, \quad (4)$$

in which as usual $\Omega_m = 8\pi G \rho_{m0}/3H_0^2$ and $\Omega_\Lambda = \Lambda/3H_0^2$.

We shall consider backward null geodesics from the origin at the present time t_0 , with affine parameter λ normalized so that $\dot{t}(0) = -1$, where the dot denotes a derivative with respect to λ . Then

$$-\dot{\tau}(\lambda) = \dot{\chi}(\lambda) = \frac{[1 + z(\lambda)]^2}{a_0}. \quad (5)$$

We now assume that in addition to a uniform distribution of matter there are random clumps present. Specifically, the matter density parameter Ω_m may be written $\Omega_m = \Omega_h + \Omega_g$, where Ω_h represents a homogeneous distribution and Ω_g a random distribution of widely separated clumps, each of mass M . (It is easy to generalize the discussion to a distribution of masses, or even to allow for a distribution changing with cosmic time.)

Consider a fiducial backward null geodesic, and a second neighboring null geodesic from the same point. We choose a vierbein $e_{(\mu)}$ at the origin, with $e_{(0)}$ in the t direction, and $e_{(3)} - e_{(0)}$ tangent to the fiducial geodesic. Then we parallel-propagate the vierbein along this geodesic, and introduce transverse coordinates $\vec{l} = (l^1, l^2)$, such that the transverse separation between the geodesics at affine distance λ is

$$\delta x^\mu = l^\alpha e_{(\alpha)}^\mu(\lambda). \quad (6)$$

(Summation over $\alpha = 1, 2$ is implied.) The rate of change of this separation is governed by the geodesic deviation equation,

$$\ddot{l}^\alpha = R^\alpha_{\mu\beta\nu} u^\mu u^\nu l^\beta, \quad (7)$$

where $u^\mu = \dot{x}^\mu$ is the null tangent vector to the fiducial geodesic.

It is convenient to define the 2×2 matrix $\mathcal{A}(\lambda) = \left(\mathcal{A}^\alpha_\beta(\lambda) \right)$ by

$$\vec{l}(\lambda) = \mathcal{A}(\lambda) \cdot \dot{\vec{l}}(0), \quad (8)$$

where $\dot{\vec{l}}(0)$ defines the initial (small) angular deviation from the fiducial geodesic. Then $\mathcal{A}$ also satisfies the geodesic deviation equation (7). It is also useful to introduce the quantity

$$A(\lambda) = \det \mathcal{A}(\lambda), \quad (9)$$

which is proportional to the reciprocal magnification of a small source. In the weak-lensing case, A is always positive. Then the angular-size (or area) distance D is given by $D = \sqrt{A}$. However, caustics are lines of infinite magnification, where $A = 0$. In the regions beyond, where $A < 0$, images are reversed. More generally,

$$D(\lambda) = \sqrt{|A|}. \quad (10)$$

For a single image of a point source, there is no need to distinguish angular-size and area distances. The distinction for large sources is discussed in Section 5.

So long as we are well away from the clumps of matter, it is reasonable to assume that the Weyl tensor is very small, *i.e.*, there is no source of shear. We make no such assumption about the effect of individual clumps. (Each clump of course introduces a source of shear in its vicinity.) Then the coefficient on the right hand side of the geodesic deviation equation involves only the Ricci tensor. Using Einstein's equations, this may be expressed in terms of the density ρ_h of the smooth component, or equivalently Ω_h . Thus, along light paths that come near to none of the clumps, we find for $\mathcal{A}$ the equation

$$\ddot{\mathcal{A}} = -\frac{3}{2}H_0^2\Omega_h(1+z)^5\mathcal{A}. \quad (11)$$

Here a factor $(1+z)^3$ comes from the z -dependence of ρ_h , while $(1+z)^2$ derives from the $u^\mu u^\nu$ factor. Clearly, away from the clumps, $\mathcal{A}$ is the solution of this equation (11) with initial conditions

$$\mathcal{A}(0) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \dot{\mathcal{A}}(0) = \mathbf{1}. \quad (12)$$

Thus for these paths, we find $\mathcal{A}(\lambda) = D_h(\lambda)\mathbf{1}$, where $D_h(\lambda)$ is the Dyer–Roeder distance, the solution of the equation

$$\ddot{D}_h = -\frac{3}{2}H_0^2\Omega_h(1+z)^5D_h, \quad (13)$$

with initial conditions

$$D_h(0) = 0, \quad \dot{D}_h(0) = 1. \quad (14)$$

It will also be useful to define the corresponding angular-diameter distance $\bar{D}(\lambda)$ for a homogeneous FRW universe with density $\bar{\rho}$, which is in fact given by

$$\bar{D}(\lambda) = a(\lambda)r(\lambda). \quad (15)$$

If the relative magnification μ of a point source, compared to that of a source at the same red-shift in the FRW universe is defined to be *negative* when the image is reversed, then

$$\mu = \frac{\bar{A}(\lambda)}{A(\lambda)}. \quad (16)$$

The magnification in the more usual sense, which is always positive, is then

$$|\mu| = \frac{\bar{A}(\lambda)}{|A(\lambda)|} = \frac{\bar{D}^2(\lambda)}{D^2(\lambda)}. \quad (17)$$

3. Effect of a clump

We now consider the effect of a clump near our null geodesics at affine distance λ . We suppose that the center of the clump is at transverse position $-\vec{x}$ from the fiducial geodesic. The effect of the clump will be to bend the geodesic through an angle $\vec{\psi}$. With the center of the clump as origin, let us introduce Euclidean coordinates $(\vec{x}, \zeta)$. Then $\vec{\psi}$ is given in terms of the Newtonian potential $\Phi(\vec{x}, \zeta)$ of the clump by

$$\vec{\psi}(\vec{x}) = -2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\zeta \vec{\nabla} \Phi(\vec{x}, \zeta), \quad (18)$$

where $\vec{\nabla}$ is the two-dimensional gradient operator. Note that if $\rho(\vec{x}, \zeta)$ is the density distribution in the clump, then, by virtue of the Poisson equation,

$$\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{\psi}(\vec{x}) = 4\pi G \sigma(\vec{x}), \quad (19)$$

with

$$\sigma(\vec{x}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\zeta \rho(\vec{x}, \zeta). \quad (20)$$

The angular deviation of a neighboring geodesic at transverse displacement $\vec{l}$, relative to that of the fiducial geodesic, will be

$$\vec{\psi}(\vec{x} + \vec{l}) - \vec{\psi}(\vec{x}) = \mathcal{K}(\vec{x}) \cdot \vec{l}, \quad (21)$$

where the 2×2 matrix $\mathcal{K}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{K}(\vec{x}) = \vec{\nabla} \vec{\psi}(\vec{x}). \quad (22)$$

Note that by the form of (18) $\mathcal{K}$ is symmetric.

Now from (5) and (8), the angular deviation of neighboring geodesics at position λ is

$$\frac{\dot{\vec{l}}}{a\dot{\chi}} = \frac{\dot{\vec{l}}}{1+z} = \frac{\dot{\mathcal{A}} \cdot \dot{\vec{l}}(0)}{1+z}. \quad (23)$$

Hence $\dot{\mathcal{A}}$ changes sharply as the geodesic passes the clump by the amount

$$\delta \dot{\mathcal{A}} = (1+z) \mathcal{K}(\vec{x}) \cdot \mathcal{A}(\lambda). \quad (24)$$

It is also possible to find a similar expression for $\delta \dot{A}$. Since

$$\dot{A} = A \operatorname{tr}(\mathcal{A}^{-1} \dot{\mathcal{A}}), \quad (25)$$

it follows that

$$\delta \dot{A} = A \operatorname{tr}(\mathcal{A}^{-1} \delta \dot{\mathcal{A}}) = (1+z) A \operatorname{tr} \mathcal{K}(\vec{x}). \quad (26)$$

Our aim now is to compute the expected value of the change in $\dot{\mathcal{A}}$ in a small interval $d\lambda$ due to the effect of a random distribution of clumps.

Since the clumps are of mass M and constitute a fraction Ω_g of the critical density, their number density (assuming no evolution) is clearly

$$n = n_0(1+z)^3, \quad n_0 = \frac{3H_0^2 \Omega_g}{8\pi G M}. \quad (27)$$

The probability of finding a clump with center at the position $(\lambda, -\vec{x})$ within small ranges $d\lambda, d^2\vec{x}$ is

$$n_0(1+z)^4 d\lambda d^2\vec{x}, \quad (28)$$

where the extra factor of $(1+z)$ occurs because $ad\chi = (1+z)d\lambda$.

To find the equation we are looking for, let us ask how $\langle \dot{\mathcal{A}} \rangle$ changes under a small change $d\lambda$ in λ . Of course, due to the smooth background, according to (11), there is a change

$$[d\langle \dot{\mathcal{A}}(\lambda) \rangle]_h = -\frac{3}{2} H_0^2 \Omega_h (1+z)^5 \langle \mathcal{A}(\lambda) \rangle d\lambda. \quad (29)$$

Now what is the average effect of the clumps? The probability that a clump is present is given by (28). Since we have assumed the clumps are uncorrelated, this probability is of course independent of the previous history, so by (24) the change due to clumps is

$$[d\langle\dot{\mathcal{A}}(\lambda)\rangle]_g = n_0(1+z)^5 d\lambda \int d^2\vec{x} \mathcal{K}(\vec{x}) \cdot \langle\mathcal{A}(\lambda)\rangle. \quad (30)$$

The next step is to compute the $\vec{x}$ integral. Using (22), we have

$$\int d^2\vec{x} \mathcal{K}(\vec{x}) = \int d^2\vec{x} \vec{\nabla} \vec{\psi}(\vec{x}) = \oint dl \vec{n} \vec{\psi}(\vec{x}), \quad (31)$$

where $\vec{n} = \vec{x}/|\vec{x}|$, and the integral is around a large circle. Now for large $\vec{x}$ we have asymptotically

$$\vec{\psi}(\vec{x}) \sim -4GM \frac{\vec{x}}{\vec{x}^2}, \quad (32)$$

whence

$$\int d^2\vec{x} \mathcal{K}(\vec{x}) = -4\pi GM \mathbf{1}. \quad (33)$$

For later use, we need one other result, concerning the integral of the determinant of $\mathcal{K}$. If $\hat{\zeta}$ is a unit vector in the direction of the fiducial null ray, then clearly

$$\hat{\zeta} \det \mathcal{K} = \vec{\nabla} \psi_1 \times \vec{\nabla} \psi_2 = \vec{\nabla} \times (\psi_1 \vec{\nabla} \psi_2). \quad (34)$$

Hence

$$\int d^2\vec{x} \det \mathcal{K} = \oint d\vec{l} \cdot (\psi_1 \vec{\nabla} \psi_2), \quad (35)$$

where the integral is again around a large circle. Clearly this vanishes in the limit, whence

$$\int d^2\vec{x} \det \mathcal{K} = 0. \quad (36)$$

Now it follows from (30), (27) and (33) that

$$[d\langle\dot{\mathcal{A}}(\lambda)\rangle]_g = -\frac{3}{2} H_0^2 \Omega_g (1+z)^5 \langle\mathcal{A}(\lambda)\rangle d\lambda. \quad (37)$$

Remarkably enough, this is of precisely the same form as (29), so, combining the two, we find

$$\langle\ddot{\mathcal{A}}(\lambda)\rangle = -\frac{3}{2} H_0^2 \Omega_m (1+z)^5 \langle\mathcal{A}(\lambda)\rangle. \quad (38)$$

In other words, $\langle\mathcal{A}(\lambda)\rangle$ is exactly the same as it would be in a homogeneous universe of equal mean density, namely

$$\langle\mathcal{A}(\lambda)\rangle = \bar{D}(\lambda) \mathbf{1}, \quad (39)$$

where $\bar{D}$ is given by (15).

It is not possible to use (26) directly to find a similar equation for the mean value of the quantity A defined by (9), because even in the homogeneous background A does not satisfy a simple homogeneous differential equation like (11). Nevertheless, we can also show that

$$\langle A(\lambda) \rangle = [\bar{D}(\lambda)]^2. \quad (40)$$

The general proof of this result is rather long and is therefore relegated to an appendix. However, in the next section we explain why it is true in the special case where a typical light path encounters no more than one clump.

This result, (40), shows that in a clumpy universe the average *reciprocal* magnification $\langle 1/\mu \rangle$, where μ is defined by (16), is exactly the same as in a homogeneous universe of equal mean density.

It is remarkable that, despite the quadratic relationship between $\mathcal{A}$ and A , the averages of both, $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ and $\langle A \rangle$, can be expressed in terms of this one function $\bar{D}$. It is very important to note, however, that $\bar{D}$ is *not* the average $\langle D \rangle$ of the angular-size or area distance of point sources — and nor is $\bar{D}^2$ equal to $\langle D^2 \rangle$ — because according to (10), $\langle D^2 \rangle = \langle |A| \rangle$. As we shall see, for a large source, $\bar{D}$ is approximately the ‘angular-size distance’ of Ellis et al. (6), not the ‘area distance’.

4. The single-clump case

To clarify the reason for the important result (40) we shall in this section specialize to the single-clump case, where the effect of multiple encounters is assumed to be negligible. This will make it easier to estimate the size of the differences.

Let us begin by finding a more explicit expression for $\langle \mathcal{A}(\lambda_s) \rangle$ for sources at affine distance λ_s in the case where the probability of encountering more than one clump is negligible. It will be useful to extend the definition of the angular-diameter distance in the ‘empty’ regions, given by (13) and (14). We define $D_h(\lambda_1, \lambda)$ to be the angular-diameter distance between λ_1 and λ in the smooth background between the clumps, *i.e.*, the solution of (13) with initial conditions

$$D_h(\lambda_1, \lambda_1) = 0, \quad \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} D_h(\lambda_1, \lambda) \right|_{\lambda=\lambda_1} = 1 + z_1. \quad (41)$$

(The factor of $(1 + z_1)$ appears because $a\dot{\chi} = 1 + z$.)

If there are no clumps near the light path, then of course $\mathcal{A}(\lambda_s) = D_h^2(\lambda_s)\mathbf{1}$. If there is a single clump at λ and transverse position $-\vec{x}$, then its deviating effect is added, so one finds

$$\mathcal{A}(\lambda_s) = D_h(\lambda_s)\mathbf{1} + D_h(\lambda, \lambda_s)\mathcal{K}(\vec{x})D_h(\lambda), \quad (42)$$

or equivalently

$$\mathcal{A}(\lambda_s) = D_h(\lambda_s)[\mathbf{1} + L(\lambda, \lambda_s)\mathcal{K}(\vec{x})], \quad (43)$$

where

$$L(\lambda, \lambda_s) = \frac{D_h(\lambda)D_h(\lambda, \lambda_s)}{D_h(\lambda_s)}. \quad (44)$$

It will be useful to define the quantity

$$J = \det[\mathbf{1} + L(\lambda, \lambda_s)\mathcal{K}(\vec{x})], \quad (45)$$

so that

$$A(\lambda_s) = D_h^2(\lambda_s)J, \quad (46)$$

Thus we see that J may be interpreted as the contribution of this clump to the reciprocal magnification (relative to the ‘empty’ regions). Note that J may be negative; it vanishes on the caustics. Note also that

$$J = 1 + L(\lambda, \lambda_s) \text{tr } \mathcal{K} + L^2(\lambda, \lambda_s) \det \mathcal{K}. \quad (47)$$

To find the average $\langle A(\lambda_s) \rangle$, we have to multiply (46) by the probability (28) of finding a clump at position $(\lambda, -\vec{x})$ and integrate over λ and $\vec{x}$:

$$\langle A(\lambda_s) \rangle = D_h^2(\lambda_s) \left[1 + \int d\lambda n_0(1+z)^4 \int d^2\vec{x} (L \text{tr } \mathcal{K} + L^2 \det \mathcal{K}) \right]. \quad (48)$$

Using (27), (33) and (36), we then find

$$\langle A(\lambda_s) \rangle = D_h^2(\lambda_s) \left[1 - 3H_0^2\Omega_g \int d\lambda (1+z)^4 L(\lambda, \lambda_s) \right], \quad (49)$$

which to this order is just (40). Note the crucial importance in deriving this result of the fact that the integral of the determinant of $\mathcal{K}$ vanishes.

5. The different averages

To understand the important distinction between *angular-size* and *area* distances or magnifications, it is helpful to consider the shape of the surface of constant z_s (or constant

λ_s , which as we argued is nearly the same thing) on the backward light cone from the present. When only weak lensing occurs, it is obviously very close to being a sphere. When there are caustics, the light cone folds back and intersects itself. Then the world line of a comoving source will meet the cone several times, leading to multiple images. But it is important to realise that the different sheets of the surface are very close to each other; the time delay between the different images is always very small on a cosmological scale. So the constant- z_s surface still lies very close to a sphere; it can essentially be described as a single sphere with some sections covered several times. We shall call this the *source sphere*.

Now let us partition the celestial sphere around the observer into small pixels, labelled by n , with solid angles $\delta\Omega_n$ (not necessarily all equal), small enough that the magnification may be taken to be constant within each. Of course $\sum_n \delta\Omega_n = 4\pi$. For each n the light arriving in the n th pixel originated from some small area δS_n of the source sphere, with

$$\delta S_n = A_n(\lambda_s)\delta\Omega_n. \quad (50)$$

Note that some of these areas may be negative.

Now, the result (40) established above shows that the total area of the source sphere is

$$\sum_n \delta S_n = \sum_n A_n(\lambda_s)\delta\Omega_n = 4\pi\langle A(\lambda_s) \rangle = 4\pi\bar{D}^2(\lambda_s). \quad (51)$$

With the demonstration that the area of the source sphere is the same as in the FRW universe of equal mean density, we provided a rigorous proof of Weinberg's argument, which was based on the principle of energy conservation (13).

We can therefore define the solid angle $\bar{\delta\Omega}_n$ that would be subtended by δS_n in the homogeneous FRW universe by

$$\bar{\delta\Omega}_n = \frac{\delta S_n}{\bar{D}^2(\lambda_s)}. \quad (52)$$

Then the magnification μ_n relative to the FRW universe is

$$\mu_n = \frac{\delta\Omega_n}{\bar{\delta\Omega}_n} = \frac{\bar{D}^2(\lambda_s)}{A_n(\lambda_s)}. \quad (53)$$

while the reciprocal magnification is

$$\frac{1}{\mu_n} = \frac{\bar{\delta\Omega}_n}{\delta\Omega_n} = \frac{A_n(\lambda_s)}{\bar{D}^2(\lambda_s)}. \quad (54)$$

The *random-direction* average of any quantity f defined on the celestial sphere is given by

$$\langle f \rangle_{\text{rd}} = \sum_n f_n(\lambda_s)\delta\Omega_n. \quad (55)$$

In particular, of course,

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{\mu} \right\rangle_{\text{rd}} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_n \frac{\delta\Omega_n}{\mu_n} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_n \overline{\delta\Omega_n} = 1. \quad (56)$$

Note that some of the terms in (56) are negative. If we consider instead the average of the modulus, we get

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{|\mu|} \right\rangle_{\text{rd}} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_n |\overline{\delta\Omega_n}| > 1. \quad (57)$$

In fact, multiplied by $\bar{D}^2(\lambda_s)$ this gives the *full* area of the source sphere, counting the regions covered more than once with the appropriate multiplicity. We may define the *areal*, as opposed to *angular-size*, distance $\bar{D}_{\text{area}}$ by

$$\bar{D}_{\text{area}}^2 = \bar{D}^2(\lambda_s) \left\langle \frac{1}{|\mu|} \right\rangle_{\text{rd}}. \quad (58)$$

Obviously, $\bar{D}_{\text{area}}(\lambda_s) > \bar{D}(\lambda_s)$.

We can also discuss *random-source* averages. To do that it is convenient to choose the pixels in a special way. Let us first partition the *source sphere* into elements labelled by p , of area $\bar{D}^2(\lambda_s) \overline{\delta\Omega_p}$. Here all $\overline{\delta\Omega_p}$ are positive, and $\sum_p \overline{\delta\Omega_p} = 4\pi$. In general, each element may have several different images, though always an odd number, say $2r_p + 1$. Let us label these image pixels $\delta\Omega_{pq}$, with $q = 1, 2, \dots, 2r_p + 1$. If we choose q so that positive and negative images alternate, then $\overline{\delta\Omega_{p1}} = \overline{\delta\Omega_p}$, $\overline{\delta\Omega_{p2}} = -\overline{\delta\Omega_p}$, $\dots$, and in general

$$\overline{\delta\Omega_{pq}} = (-)^{q-1} \overline{\delta\Omega_p}. \quad (59)$$

It then follows that

$$\sum_q \overline{\delta\Omega_{pq}} = 4\pi, \quad (60)$$

but

$$\sum_q |\overline{\delta\Omega_{pq}}| = 4\pi \frac{\bar{D}_{\text{area}}^2(\lambda_s)}{\bar{D}^2(\lambda_s)}. \quad (61)$$

The random-source average of some quantity f defined for each element of the *source* sphere is

$$\langle f \rangle_{\text{rs}} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_p f_p \overline{\delta\Omega_p}. \quad (62)$$

Consider for example N sources of given absolute magnitude randomly distributed on the source sphere, with $n_p \overline{\delta\Omega_p}$ in element p . Then clearly

$$\langle n \rangle_{\text{rs}} = \frac{N}{4\pi}. \quad (63)$$

What can one say about their average magnification? Actually, there are two possible meanings of the term. The first is appropriate if the various images of each source are *unresolved*. Then the total magnification of a source in $\overline{\delta\Omega_p}$ is the sum of the magnifications of the separate images, each counted positively,

$$\mu_p^{\text{tot}} = \sum_q |\mu_{pq}|. \quad (64)$$

It follows that

$$\langle \mu^{\text{tot}} \rangle_{\text{rs}} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{p,q} |\mu_{pq}| \overline{\delta\Omega_p} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{p,q} |\mu_{pq}| |\overline{\delta\Omega_{pq}}|. \quad (65)$$

However, the signs of μ_{pq} and $\overline{\delta\Omega_{pq}}$ are the same, so we may remove the modulus signs, to obtain

$$\langle \mu^{\text{tot}} \rangle_{\text{rs}} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{p,q} \delta\Omega_{pq} = 1. \quad (66)$$

Thus from our earlier result, that the *random-direction* average of *reciprocal* magnification in unity, we have an important corollary, that the *random-source* average of *total*, *direct* magnification is also unity. Note, however, the important distinction, that every term in (65) is positive, whereas many terms in (56) are negative.

The situation is different if the various images are *resolved* (as may usually happen when the lenses are clusters). Then the quantity of interest would be the average magnification of the individual images. Now clearly the total amount of radiant energy arriving at the observer is the same whether the images are resolved or not. The difference is that the total number of images is larger than the number of sources. To define the random-source average for *resolved* images, we should divide not by 4π but by the total solid angle the source sphere with all its folds subtend, namely $4\pi \bar{D}_{\text{area}}^2 / \bar{D}^2 = 4\pi \langle |\mu|^{-1} \rangle_{\text{rd}}$. Hence

$$\langle \mu^{\text{resolved}} \rangle_{\text{rs}} = \frac{\bar{D}^2(\lambda_s)}{\bar{D}_{\text{area}}^2(\lambda_s)} = \frac{1}{\langle |\mu|^{-1} \rangle_{\text{rd}}}. \quad (67)$$

Here again we have a relation between a random-source and a random-direction average.

We conclude this section by estimating the magnitude of the difference between areal and angular-size distances for the single-clump approximation used in the preceding section. The reciprocal magnification $1/\mu$ when the light passes a single clump at $(\lambda, -\vec{x})$ is

$$\frac{1}{\mu} = \frac{D_h^2(\lambda_s)}{\bar{D}^2(\lambda_s)} J, \quad (68)$$

where J is given by (45). In going from the angular-size to the areal distance, according to (58), we have to replace μ by $|\mu|$, which in this case amounts to replacing J by $|J|$. Since

the integrand in (48) is just $J - 1$, this replacement yields

$$\bar{D}_{\text{area}}^2 = \langle |A(\lambda_s)| \rangle = D_h^2(\lambda_s) \left[1 + \int d\lambda n_0(1+z)^4 \int d^2\vec{x} (|J| - 1) \right]. \quad (69)$$

To be specific, we adopt essentially the modified isothermal sphere profile suggested by Brainerd et al. (2). In this distribution, the density at radial distance r is given by

$$\rho(r) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2\pi G} \frac{s^2}{r^2(r^2 + s^2)}, \quad (70)$$

where σ is the line-of-sight velocity dispersion, and s is a truncation scale, beyond which ρ falls rapidly, like $1/r^4$. The total mass M of this distribution is finite, with

$$M = \frac{\pi\sigma^2 s}{G}. \quad (71)$$

For our purposes it is more convenient to adopt a slightly modified version of the profile, designed to avoid the infinite density at $r = 0$. We take

$$\rho(r) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2\pi G} \frac{s^2}{(r^2 + a^2)(r^2 + s^2)}, \quad (72)$$

where the core radius $a \ll s$. To be specific, we choose $a = 0.01s$. This profile shares most of the desirable properties of (70); over the wide region where $a \ll r \ll s$, the density scales like $1/r^2$, and the scattering angle ψ can still be computed analytically.

The results presented in the table below are for a flat universe with $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, $\Omega_m = 0.27$ and $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.73$. We present illustrative parameters for galaxies with $M = 10^{11} M_\odot$, $\sigma = 180 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ and $\Omega_g = 0.135$, and for clusters with $M = 10^{15} M_\odot$, $\sigma = 1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ and $\Omega_g = 0.0135$, in both cases for sources at $z_s = 1$ and $z_s = 2$. The table lists D_h and $\bar{D}$, as well as the difference between $\bar{D}_{\text{area}}$ and $\bar{D}$.

The fact that the differences are much larger for galaxies than for clusters is due to the larger fraction of mass in the clumps, Ω_g , and to the dependence on M and σ . The relevant parameter is M/s^2 or σ^4/M , which is larger for galaxies by an order of magnitude. At $z_s = 1$ the difference between areal and angular-size distances is not very significant, but by $z_s = 2$, the effect of galaxies is to make the random-source average 3% greater than the random-direction one.

6. Appropriate measures of magnification

As we noted in the introduction, the appropriate measure of magnification depends on the type of source being observed, the mode of observation, and the manner in which the data are to be interpreted.

Table 1: The angular size and area distances ($\bar{D}$ and D_{area}) to a source at redshift z_s in a $\Omega_m = 0.27$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.73$ Universe where matter amounting to a normalized density of Ω_g exists in isothermal spheres, each of total mass M and velocity dispersion σ , equations (71) through (73), and the rest of the matter is distributed homogeneously with a normalized density of $\Omega_m - \Omega_g$. The quantity $\bar{D}$ represents the average reciprocal magnification over random directions in the sky, or the average magnification of randomly selected sources when the observed images for each source are unresolved. The parameter D_h , which is the angular size distance under the scenario of the light path between a small emitter and the observer passing through only the homogeneous component (i.e. it misses all the clumps), is also tabulated.

M ($M_\odot$)	σ (km/s)	Ω_g	z_s	D_h (Gpc)	$\bar{D}$ (Gpc)	$D_{\text{area}} - \bar{D}$ (Mpc)
10^{11}	180	0.135	1	1.74	1.69	13.1
10^{11}	180	0.135	2	1.96	1.79	62.6
10^{15}	1000	0.0135	1	1.74	1.69	0.015
10^{15}	1000	0.0135	2	1.96	1.79	0.17

Consider first a number count of discrete sources, say Type-1A supernovae. Clearly the expected number is proportional to the area of the source sphere. However, the number count can have two meanings. If the strong lenses are large — say galaxy clusters — so that the various images of a source are distinct and well resolved, then we may be interested in the total number of images, whether or not they come from the same source. In that case, we need the *area* distance, $\bar{D}_{\text{area}}$; the number of images is proportional to the *total* area of the source covered as we scan an area of sky. On the other hand, if the lenses are smaller and the various images are not resolved, we would be more interested in the total number of *distinct* sources. In that case, the appropriate measure is the *angular-size* distance.

A different question we may ask about discrete sources is their average magnification. Here we should use the *random-source* average. Again, there are two possible questions we might ask: What is the average magnification of each separate image? Or (if the images are not resolved) what is the average total magnification of the combined images? According to (66), the answer to the second question is exactly the same as in a homogeneous FRW universe of equal mean density. On the other hand, the answer to the first question is obviously less, reduced by the factor (67).

The situation with regard to a continuous source such as the cosmic microwave background (CMB) is different. If an intervening lens magnifies a discrete source behind it, the source appears brighter, because it fills a larger area of the sky. This is not the case with

the CMB. The effect of magnification is that the radiation we see coming from one patch of sky originates from a smaller area of the source — in this case the last scattering surface. The surface brightness is unchanged. Lensing cannot change the temperature of a patch of sky, nor the temperature difference between two different spots. What it *can* change is the observed angular separation of these two spots. In other words, if there is hot spot on the last scattering surface, it may appear to us larger or smaller than it would in a homogeneous universe.

For the CMB, the correlations between the temperatures at pairs of points are controlled by the distance between source points rather than the area of source surface enclosed, so in considering for example the effect on the position of the acoustic peaks in the angular power spectrum we should use the *angular-size* distance. This is the measure for which the average is precisely the same as in a homogeneous universe of equal mean density. Our conclusion would not necessarily hold for *very* small scales, at or below the typical angular separation of lensed images, though such scales are below the limit of resolution of current CMB observations.

This does not mean, however, that there could be no observable effect. The average magnification is unchanged, but the distribution around the average could be markedly affected with a separation between the mode and the mean, Lieu & Mittaz (9). Moreover, the acoustic peaks may be observably broadened, Lieu & Mittaz (10). One source of skewness in the distribution operates on an angular scale such that the average region contains less than one clump. In that case, when we choose a random area of sky of the prescribed size, it is very likely to contain no clumps at all, in which case it will be demagnified. On the other hand in those rare cases when it does contain a clump, there will be a comparatively large magnification. So the peak may be shifted to a smaller scale. There has already been considerable discussion of this issue in the literature; see for example (Zaldarriaga & Seljak; 1).

7. Discussion

We have seen that so long as the weak-lensing condition is well satisfied, the average magnification or reciprocal magnification (in whatever sense) is essentially the same as in a homogeneous universe of equal mean (or pre-clumping) density, *provided* of course that our assumptions are correct, namely that the clumps are uncorrelated and well separated and that the gravitational effect of each can be treated in a Newtonian approximation. When the clumps are *not* well separated, then it may no longer be legitimate to assume that their contributions simply add, though we see no reason why that should not be true. We have

also ignored any time-dependence in the Newtonian potential, so the clumps must not be moving too rapidly, and must be small enough for the integrated Sachs–Wolfe effect to be negligible. Probably the most significant shortcoming of our approach is the assumption that the clumps are uncorrelated. Although we have considered explicitly only one size, there would be no real difficulty in including clumps of many sizes. But the effect of correlation between clumps of different sizes might well be important.

When we approach the strong-lensing regime, on the other hand, the various averages are not the same, and in particular we must distinguish angular-size and areal distances. The random-direction angular-size average of the reciprocal magnification $\langle 1/\mu \rangle_{\text{rd}}$ is just the same as in a homogeneous universe of equal mean density, and as a corollary, the same is true of the random-source average of the *total* magnification of unresolved images, $\langle \mu^{\text{tot}} \rangle_{\text{rs}}$. However, the random-source average of the magnification of *resolved* images, $\langle \mu^{\text{resolved}} \rangle_{\text{rs}}$ may be significantly different, especially for the most distant sources. The difference between $\bar{D}_{\text{area}}$ and $\bar{D}$ increases rapidly with increasing z .

Appendix. Average of A

In this appendix, we present a proof of the relation (40) between $\langle A \rangle$ and $\bar{D}$.

Let us consider a cylinder of fixed radius R centered on our fiducial geodesic, and extending out to λ_s . We choose R sufficiently large that clumps outside the cylinder have negligible effect; the value of R will drop out of the final answer. It is useful to consider in more detail the process of averaging over clumps. Clearly by (27), the probability that *no* clumps are found within the cylinder is

$$P_0(\lambda_s) = \exp \left[-n_0 \pi R^2 \int_0^{\lambda_s} (1+z)^4 d\lambda \right]. \quad (73)$$

The probability that exactly N clumps are found in the cylinder, at positions $\{(\lambda_j, -\vec{x}_j), j = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$ is

$$P_0(\lambda_s) n_0^N \prod_{j=1}^N (1+z_j)^4 d\lambda_j d^2 \vec{x}_j. \quad (74)$$

Now what is the value of $\mathcal{A}(\lambda_s)$ if N clumps are present at these positions? Of course, if $N = 0$, then $\mathcal{A}(\lambda_s) = D_h(0, \lambda_s) \mathbf{1}$. If there is just one clump, at $(\lambda_1, -\vec{x}_1)$, its deviation effect is added, so we get

$$\mathcal{A}(\lambda_s) = D_h(0, \lambda_s) \mathbf{1} + D_h(0, \lambda_1) \mathcal{K}(\vec{x}_1) D_h(\lambda_1, \lambda_s). \quad (75)$$

For $N = 2$, there are four terms, these two plus two more in which $\mathcal{K}(\vec{x}_2)$ also appears. In general, we can write

$$\mathcal{A}(\lambda_s) = \sum_I \mathcal{A}_I, \quad (76)$$

where the sum is over all subsets I of $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Here, if $I = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_P\}$, then

$$\mathcal{A}_I(\lambda_s) = \prod_{j=0}^P D_h(\lambda_{i_j}, \lambda_{i_{j+1}}) \prod_{j=1}^P \mathcal{K}(\vec{x}_{i_j}), \quad (77)$$

where $\lambda_{i_0} = 0$ and $\lambda_{i_{P+1}} = \lambda_s$.

We can now recover our expression for $\langle \mathcal{A}(\lambda_s) \rangle$. To do this we integrate (76) over the measure (74) and then sum over N . Now when we integrate over $\vec{x}_i$, then if $i \in I$, by (33) we recover a factor of $-4\pi G M \mathbf{1}$, whereas if $i \notin I$, we get simply πR^2 . It is then convenient to sum separately over the number of elements P in the selected subset I , and the number in the complement, $Q = N - P$. It is easily seen that the sum over Q gives an exponential that precisely cancels the factor $P_0(\lambda_s)$. Thus, again using (27), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{A}(\lambda_s) \rangle &= \mathbf{1} \sum_{P=0}^{\infty} \left(-\frac{3}{2} H_0^2 \Omega_g \right)^P \int_0^{\lambda_s} d\lambda_1 \int_{\lambda_1}^{\lambda_s} d\lambda_2 \dots \int_{\lambda_{P-1}}^{\lambda_s} d\lambda_P \\ &\quad \prod_{j=1}^P (1 + z_j)^4 \prod_{j=0}^P D_h(\lambda_j, \lambda_{j+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

again with $\lambda_0 = 0$ and $\lambda_{P+1} = \lambda_s$. It is easy to see that this is precisely the perturbation solution in powers of Ω_g of (38), so this again proves that $\langle \mathcal{A}(\lambda_s) \rangle = \bar{D}(\lambda_s) \mathbf{1}$. (Note that the required extra factor of $(1 + z_j)$ comes from the initial condition (41) for $D_h(\lambda_j, \lambda_{j+1})$.)

Next we turn to the computation of $\langle A \rangle = \langle \det \mathcal{A} \rangle$. Suppose as before that there are N clumps within our cylinder. Then from (76), using the identity $\det \mathcal{A} = \frac{1}{2}[(\text{tr} \mathcal{A})^2 - \text{tr}(\mathcal{A}^2)]$ for 2×2 matrices, we have

$$\det \mathcal{A}(\lambda_s) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_I \sum_J [(\text{tr} \mathcal{A}_I)(\text{tr} \mathcal{A}_J) - \text{tr}(\mathcal{A}_I \mathcal{A}_J)], \quad (79)$$

where I and J are arbitrary subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, and $\mathcal{A}_I, \mathcal{A}_J$ are given by (77).

Now consider the effect of the integrations over $\vec{x}_i$. As before, if $i \notin I$ and $i \notin J$, the integral gives simply πR^2 , and the sum over all such contributions generates an exponential that cancels $P_0(\lambda_s)$. Next, consider the indices that belong to one of the two subsets only, say $i \in I$ but $i \notin J$. Then $\mathcal{K}(\vec{x}_i)$ appears only once in each term of (79), so we can immediately

perform the integral, and replace $\mathcal{K}(\vec{x}_i)$ with a factor $-4\pi GM\mathbf{1}$. Lastly, we are left with the indices, say $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_S\}$ that are common to both I and J . They contribute a factor

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int d^2\vec{x}_{i_1} \dots d^2\vec{x}_{i_S} (\{\text{tr}[\mathcal{K}(\vec{x}_{i_1}) \dots \mathcal{K}(\vec{x}_{i_S})]\}^2 - \text{tr}\{\mathcal{K}(\vec{x}_{i_1}) \dots \mathcal{K}(\vec{x}_{i_S})\}^2) \\ &= \int d^2\vec{x}_{i_1} \dots d^2\vec{x}_{i_S} \det[\mathcal{K}(\vec{x}_{i_1}) \dots \mathcal{K}(\vec{x}_{i_S})]. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

But now in virtue of (36), this expression vanishes unless $S = 0$.

So finally we are left with a sum only over disjoint sets I and J . When we have performed the integrations over $\vec{x}_i$, all the matrices are proportional to $\mathbf{1}$, so the trace merely gives a factor of 2 which cancels the $\frac{1}{2}$ in (79). The remaining factors, for each of the two sums separately, are identical with those in (78), so we find

$$\langle A(\lambda_s) \rangle = [\bar{D}(\lambda_s)]^2. \quad (81)$$

This concludes the proof.

Acknowledgements

We are indebted to R.D. Blandford and P.J.E. Peebles for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- Bartelmann, M. and Schneider, P., 2001, Physics Reports, 340, 291.
- Brainerd, T.G., Blandford, R.D. and Smail, I., 1996, Ap.J., 466, 623.
- Claudel, C.-M., 2000, Proc. Roy. Soc. A, 456, 1455 (2000) (gr-qc/0005097)
- Dyer, C.C. and Roeder, R.C., 1972, Ap.J., 174, L115
- Dyer, C.C. and Roeder, R.C., 1973, Ap.J., 180, L31
- Ellis, G.F.R., Bassett, B.A. and Dunsby, P.K.S., 1998, Class. Quant. Grav., 15, 2345 (gr-qc/9801092)
- Futumase, T. and Sasaki, M., 1989, Phys. Rev. D, 40, 2502
- Holz, D.E. and Wald, E.M., 1998, Phys. Rev. D, 58, 301 (1998) (astro-ph/9708036)

- Lieu, R. and Mittaz, J.P.D., 2005, ApJ, 623, L1.
- Lieu, R. and Mittaz, J.P.D., 2005, ApJ, in press.
- Metcalf, R. and Silk, J., 1997, Ap.J., 489, 1
- Rose, H.G., 2001, Ap.J., 560, L15 ([astro-ph/0106489](#))
- Weinberg, S., 1976, Ap.J. 208, L1
- Zaldarriaga, M. and Seljak, U., 1999, Phys. Rev. D, 59, 123507.